

1 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
2 United States Attorney
3 DAVID T. RYAN
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 Chief, National Security Division
6 DAVID C. LACHMAN (Cal. Bar No. 261711)
7 Assistant United States Attorney
8 Terrorism and Export Crimes Section
9 1500 United States Courthouse
10 312 North Spring Street
11 Los Angeles, California 90012
12 Telephone: (213) 894-5564
13 Facsimile: (213) 894-2927
14 E-mail: david.lachman@usdoj.gov

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

20 No. 2:25-CR-00209-AH-2

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 JUAN CHRISTOBAL IBARRA,

24 Defendant.

25 GOVERNMENT'S EX PARTE APPLICATION
26 FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING
27 DISCOVERY CONTAINING PERSONAL
28 IDENTIFYING INFORMATION, PRIVACY
ACT INFORMATION, AND CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMANT INFORMATION; DECLARATION
OF DAVID C. LACHMAN

29 PROPOSED ORDER FILED SEPARATELY

30 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel
31 of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of
32 California and Assistant United States Attorney David C. Lachman,
33 hereby applies ex parte for a protective order in this case governing
34 the use and dissemination of personal identifying information,
35 Privacy Act information, and confidential informant information.

36 This application is based upon the attached memorandum of points
37 and authorities, the files and records in this case, the Declaration

1 of David C. Lachman, and such further evidence and argument as the
2 Court may permit.

3 Defendant Juan Christobal IBARRA ("defendant"), by and through
4 his counsel of record, Deputy Federal Public Defender Rebecca Harris,
5 does not object to a protective order generally or the ex parte
6 nature of this application. Defendant, however, objects to certain
7 provisions of the government's proposed protective order, discussed
8 below, and requests 48 hours to file objections to this application.
9 Defendant Victor Ricardo GARZA PULIDO has not yet appeared in this
10 case.¹

11 Dated: July 19, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

12 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
United States Attorney

13 DAVID T. RYAN
Assistant United States Attorney
14 Chief, National Security Division

16 _____
17 /s/
DAVID C. LACHMAN
18 Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Plaintiff
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

27 ¹ GARZA PULIDO was arrested by Santa Maria Police Department
28 officers on July 6, 2025, and is currently in state custody on
charges of possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine and
fentanyl.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
3	II.	A PROTECTIVE ORDER IS NECESSARY IN THIS CASE.....	2
4	III.	DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS SHOULD BE OVERRULED.....	5
5	A.	The Definition of "Confidential Information" Should Include Any Document or Information Containing CI Materials or PII Materials (¶ 6(c)).....	5
6	B.	The Government Should Be Allowed to Redact PII (¶ 6(e)).....	6
7	C.	Witnesses Should Review CI Materials in the Presence of Defense Counsel (¶ 6(l)).....	8
8	D.	Witnesses or Potential Witnesses Should Have to Agree "In Writing" to Be Bound by the Protective Order (¶ 6(l)).....	11
9	E.	At the Conclusion of Appellate and Post-Conviction Proceedings, Defense Counsel Should Return or Destroy CI Materials (¶ 6(r))	13
14	IV.	CONCLUSION.....	15

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

2 CASES	PAGE
3 <u>Monfils v. Taylor</u> , 165 F.3d 511 (7th Cir. 1998)	4
4 <u>Nelson v. City of Madison Heights</u> , 845 F.3d 695 (6th Cir. 2017)	4
5 <u>United States v. Alvarado</u> , 2:25-cr-00155-JFW, Dkt. 71 (C.D. Cal. 6 Mar. 14, 2022)	10, 15
6 <u>United States v. Annas</u> , 2:25-cr-00069-AH, Dkt. 19 (C.D. Cal. 7 Mar. 27, 2025)	2
8 <u>United States v. Bobadilla</u> , 2:23-cr-00420-AB, Dkt. 33 (C.D. Cal. 9 July 2, 2024)	8
9 <u>United States v. Bonilla</u> , 2:24-cr-00500-JFW, Dkts. 88, 95 (C.D. 10 Cal. Sept. 2024)	10
11 <u>United States v. Dent</u> , 2017 WL 1025162 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2017)	3
12 <u>United States v. Doe</u> , 705 F.3d 1134, 1150 (9th Cir. 2013)	6
13 <u>United States v. Gong</u> , 2:24-cr-00127-JFW, Dkt. 36 (C.D. Cal. May 14 8, 2024)	8
15 <u>United States v. Gottfried</u> , 2:24-cr-00308-JLS, Dkt. 29 (C.D. 16 Cal. Sept. 6, 2024)	15
17 <u>United States v. Henriquez</u> , 2:25-cr-00104-AH-1, Dkt. 54 (C. D. 18 Cal. Apr. 24, 2025)	2, 10
19 <u>United States v. Hicks</u> , 8:20-cr-00140-VAP, Dkt. 60 (C.D. Cal. 20 Sept. 14, 2021)	8, 14
21 <u>United States v. Hovhannisyan</u> , 2:19-cr-00411-GW (C.D. Cal. Feb. 22 28, 2020)	14
23 <u>United States v. Hurtado Olivares</u> , 2:22-cr-00248-ODW, Dkt. 43 24 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2022)	15
25 <u>United States v. Carrillo-Marquez</u> , 2:24-cr-00449-MCS (C.D. Cal. 26 Sept. 19, 2024)	14
27 <u>United States v. Monteagudo</u> , 2:19-cr-00690-ODW-2, Dkt. 30 (C.D. 28 Cal. Feb. 12, 2020)	11
29 <u>United States v. Ortiz</u> , 2:22-cr-00401-MCS, Dkt. 41 (C. D. Cal. 30 Dec. 5, 2022)	11
31 <u>United States v. Perez</u> , 2:21-cr-00089-AB, Dkt. 52 (C.D. Cal. 32 Jun. 2, 2021)	8

1	<u>United States v. Ramos</u> , 2:22-cr-00354-RGK, Dkt. 158 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 1, 2022).....	10
2	<u>United States v. Rodriguez-Martinez</u> , 2:22-cr-00337-SVW, Dkt. 21 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2022).....	10
3	<u>United States v. Sanchez</u> , 2:25-cr-00221-AH, Dkt. 28 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2025).....	2, 7
4	<u>United States v. Sexton</u> , 2:19-cr-00781-MWF-1, Dkt. 43 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 2020).....	11
5	<u>United States v. Sumber</u> , 2:24-cr-00419-WLH, Dkt. 24 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2024).....	15
6	<u>United States v. Torres</u> , 2:21-cr-00294-GW, Dkt. 47 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2021).....	15
7	<u>United States v. Vo</u> , 8:24-cr-00075-DOC, Dkt. 52 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2024).....	10, 14
8	<u>Will v. United States</u> , 389 U.S. 90 (1967).....	3
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants Victor Ricardo GARZA PULIDO and Juan Christobal IBARRA collectively sold approximately more than four kilograms of methamphetamine to a confidential informant (the "CI") working with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives ("ATF") and an undercover ATF agent between January and July 2023. Specifically, IBARRA sold 451 grams of methamphetamine to the CI on June 15, 2023, and 426 grams of methamphetamine to the CI on July 13, 2023. For these crimes, defendants are charged with distribution of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b) (1) (A) (viii).

The government has produced approximately 3,745 pages of discovery to IBARRA, including law enforcement reports, criminal history reports, forensic lab reports, and toll, ping, and GPS tracker results. The government has also disclosed to defendant that it is in possession of additional discovery, including video and audio recordings, that contain identifying information regarding the CI, as well as the personal identifying information of third parties and information covered by the Privacy Act. The government has met and conferred with defense counsel regarding the government's Proposed Protective Order. While defense counsel agrees that a protective order should be entered in this case, the government understands that defense counsel objects to the following portions of the Proposed Protective Order:

- The definition of "Confidential Information," which defense counsel contends should refer solely to "information contained within documents and not "any document" containing

1 CI Materials or PII Materials. (Proposed Protective Order
 2 ¶ 6(c).)

- 3 • Allowing the government to redact redaction PII produced
 4 under the Protective Order. (*Id.* ¶ 6(e).)
- 5 • Requiring defense counsel to be present whenever any CI
 6 Materials are being shown to a witness or potential witness.
 7 (*Id.* ¶ 6(l).)
- 8 • Requiring witnesses to agree in writing to be bound by the
 9 terms of the proposed protective order prior to viewing any
 10 protected discovery. (*Id.*)
- 11 • Requiring defense counsel to return or destroy CI Materials
 12 within 30 days of the conclusion of appellate and post-
 13 conviction proceedings. (*Id.* ¶ 6(r).)

14 As discussed below, the contested provisions are critical to the
 15 protection of sensitive information, do not impede defendant's
 16 ability to review discovery. The government's Proposed Protective
 17 Order conforms with recent protective orders entered by this Court.

18 See, e.g., United States v. Henriquez, 2:25-cr-00104-AH-1, Dkt. 54
 19 (C. D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2025); United States v. Sanchez, 2:25-cr-00221-
 20 AH, Dkt. 28 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2025) (overruling defense
 21 objections); United States v. Annas, 2:25-cr-00069-AH, Dkt. 19 (C.D.
 22 Cal. Mar. 27, 2025) (entering stipulated protective order with the
 23 government's proposed protections). For these reasons and those set
 24 forth below, the Court should enter the government's Proposed
 25 Protective Order without modification.

26 **II. A PROTECTIVE ORDER IS NECESSARY IN THIS CASE**

27 Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(d)(1), the Court may
 28 "for good cause, deny, restrict, or defer discovery or inspection, or

1 grant other appropriate relief." To determine whether a protective
 2 order is appropriate, courts may consider a variety of factors,
 3 including the "safety of witnesses and others." Fed. R. Crim. Proc.
 4 16 advisory committee's note to 1966 amendment; see also United
 5 States v. Dent, 2017 WL 1025162 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2017). Indeed,
 6 Rule 16's advisory committee notes provide that "it is obvious that
 7 [a protective order] would be appropriate where there is reason to
 8 believe that a witness would be subject to physical or economic harm
 9 if his identity is revealed." Fed. R. Crim. P. 16 advisory
 10 committee's note to 1974 amendment (citing Will v. United States, 389
 11 U.S. 90 (1967)).

12 Here, a protective order is necessary because the government
 13 intends to produce to the defense materials regarding a confidential
 14 informant who participated in the government's investigation ("CI
 15 Materials"). Because these materials could be used to identify the
 16 confidential informant, the government believes that the unauthorized
 17 dissemination or distribution of the materials may compromise the
 18 ability of such persons to participate effectively in future
 19 investigations in an undercover capacity and/or may expose him/her to
 20 potential safety risks.¹

21 A protective order is also necessary to permit the government to
 22 produce discovery containing PII of third parties ("PII Materials").
 23

24 ¹ This concern is not a hypothetical one. Based on information
 25 provided by ATF Special Agent Christopher Stantzos, IBARRA has sought
 26 to identify and retaliate against the CI in this case. See also
Nelson v. City of Madison Heights, 845 F.3d 695 (6th Cir. 2017)
 27 (murder of an informant following the disclosure of her identity);
Monfils v. Taylor, 165 F.3d 511 (7th Cir. 1998) (murder of an
 informant following the disclosure of an audio recording of the
 informant's voice); Ryder v. Booth, No. 16-00065 HG-KSC, 2016 WL
 28 2745809 (D. Haw. May 11, 2016) (murder of a CI following inadvertent
 disclosure of his identity).

1 Unauthorized disclosure of PII places those third parties at risk of
2 various harms, including physical, financial, and reputational harm
3 through potential misuse of their information. The government
4 believes that disclosure of this information without limitation risks
5 the privacy and security of the information's legitimate owners.
6 Because the government has an ongoing obligation to protect third
7 parties' PII, the government cannot produce to defendant an
8 unredacted set of discovery containing this information without the
9 Court entering the Protective Order.

10 PII makes up a significant part of the discovery in this case
11 and such information itself, in many instances, has evidentiary
12 value. If the government were to attempt to redact all this
13 information in strict compliance with Federal Rule of Criminal
14 Procedure 49.1, the Central District of California's Local Rules
15 regarding redaction, and the Privacy Policy of the United States
16 Judicial Conference, the defense would receive a set of discovery
17 that would be highly confusing and difficult to understand, and it
18 would be challenging for defense counsel to adequately evaluate the
19 case, provide advice to defendant, or prepare for trial.

20 Finally, an order is also necessary because the government
21 intends to produce to the defense materials that may contain
22 information within the scope of the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a
23 ("Privacy Act Information"). To the extent that these materials
24 contain Privacy Act Information, an order is necessary to authorize
25 disclosure pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b) (11).

26 In sum, the purpose of the protective order is to (a) allow the
27 government to comply with its discovery obligations while protecting
28 sensitive information from unauthorized dissemination, and (b)

1 provide the defense with sufficient information to adequately
2 represent the defendant.

3 **III. DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS SHOULD BE OVERRULED**

4 Defendant's objections to certain provisions of the Proposed
5 Protective Order risk compromising the CI's safety and third-party
6 information contained in the discovery, and run counter to a myriad
7 of protective orders entered by this Court. The objections should be
8 overruled, and the Proposed Protective Order should be entered
9 without modification.

10 **A. The Definition of "Confidential Information" Should Include
11 Any Document or Information Containing CI Materials or PII
12 Materials (¶ 6(c))**

13 This Court should reject defendant's objection to the definition
14 of "Confidential Information," which proposes to narrow the
15 definition so that "Confidential Information" only refers to only the
16 CI Materials or PII Materials contained within documents and not to
17 the documents themselves. Defendant's objection fails to address the
18 serious practical implementation issues such a definition would
19 create. If defendant's proposed definition of "Confidential
20 Information" were adopted, and only portions of documents,
21 audio/video recordings, or photographs were produced under the
22 protective order, this risks improper disclosure of CI Materials or
23 PII Materials because of potential confusion about which portion of a
24 document (or audio/video recording or photograph) is subject to the
25 protective order and which is not. For example, if a defendant or
26 witness was taking notes on a video with some portions subject to the
27 protective order and other portions not, there is a substantial risk
28 of inadvertent dissemination of protected information because of
confusion about which portion was which. Defendant's proposed

1 definition also would create serious implementation issues as to how
2 the government will clearly designate only portions of an audio/video
3 recording or photograph subject to the protective order, and require
4 a time-consuming review and marking of individual documents that
5 would not serve any substantial interest.

6 **B. The Government Should Be Allowed to Redact PII (¶ 6(e))**

7 Defense counsel objects to paragraph 6(e) of the proposed
8 protective order, which permits the government to redact sensitive,
9 non-relevant PII -- like social security numbers -- even from
10 confidential documents. Because third parties have rights requiring
11 PII protection, and defendant has no interest in irrelevant
12 information, the redaction provision should remain.

13 While defendants are entitled to broad discovery, that discovery
14 must be "material." See, e.g., United States v. Doe, 705 F.3d 1134,
15 1150 (9th Cir. 2013). Defendants "must make a threshold showing of
16 materiality, which requires a presentation of facts which would tend
17 to show that the Government is in possession of information helpful
18 to the defense." Id. Victims and third parties, meanwhile, have
19 rights in the criminal justice system as well. The government has an
20 ongoing obligation to protect their privacy and PII. See, e.g.,
21 Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b) (government cannot disclose
22 any record containing personal information unless the relevant person
23 provides consent or a limited set of exceptions apply); 18 U.S.C. §
24 3771(a)(8) ("A crime victim has ... [t]he right to be treated with
25 fairness and with respect for the victim's dignity and privacy.").
26 To protect those rights, the government should be able to redact
27 immaterial information such as social security numbers and dates of
28 birth. The harms from disclosure of this information -- whether

1 intentional or merely accidental -- are significant. Litigation
2 typically involves large quantities of electronic and paper copies of
3 documents, any one of which could lead to disclosure of protected
4 data.

5 Meanwhile, the defense suffers no loss from redactions of such
6 irrelevant information. For example, a third party's social security
7 number, absent more, is not relevant to the defense. If the defense
8 identifies a particular need for specified information, the parties
9 can meet and confer on potential solutions, including the production
10 of unredacted versions of the discovery. But the protective order
11 itself should allow for common-sense precautions in dealing with
12 highly sensitive information.

13 The redaction provision is not frequently challenged. When it
14 is, however, courts in this district have repeatedly agreed that
15 redactions are appropriate even on confidential documents. See,
16 e.g., Sanchez, 2:25-cr-00221-AH, Dkt. 28 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2025)
17 (overruling defense objections); United States v. Bobadilla, 2:23-cr-
18 00420-AB, Dkt. 33 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2024) (PII and Privacy Act
19 materials); United States v. Gong, 2:24-cr-00127-JFW, Dkt. 36 (C.D.
20 Cal. May 8, 2024) (trade secret, proprietary and PII materials);
21 United States v. Hicks, 8:20-cr-00140-VAP, Dkt. 60 (C.D. Cal. Sept.
22 14, 2021) (PII materials); United States v. Perez, 2:21-cr-00089-AB,
23 Dkt. 52 (C.D. Cal. Jun. 2, 2021) (PII materials).

24 The Court should reach the same conclusion here for three
25 reasons. First, even if a protective order would provide some
26 protection of PII, redaction provides additional security against
27 inadvertent disclosure or unauthorized access. This belt-and-
28 suspenders approach does not unduly prejudice defendant. Should a

dispute arise about the relevance or importance of any redacted PII, defendant is always able to raise the issue with the government, and if needed, seek relief from the Court.

4 Second, the government does not intend to redact all the PII in
5 this case. The proposed protective order therefore allows the
6 government to redact only the most sensitive PII without rendering
7 the discovery confusing and difficult to understand. To the extent
8 that defendant believes the government has redacted too much,
9 defendant can, as explained above, work with the government or move
10 the Court to resolve any disputes on a case-by-case basis.

11 Third, some redactions will undoubtedly be necessary, as
12 explained above. To impose additional, unusual, and wholesale
13 restrictions upon the government or preclude the government entirely
14 from redacting non-discoverable, sensitive PII altogether is unwarranted
15 and risks the safety of witnesses, third parties, CIs, and undercover
16 agents, who already fear for their safety. The provision should be
17 maintained.

C. Witnesses Should Review CI Materials Only in the Presence of Defense Counsel (¶ 6(1))

Defendant IBARRA objects to Paragraph 6(1) of the Proposed Protective Order, which requires defense counsel to be present when any witnesses review CI Materials. The Court should reject defendant's objections because they would increase the risk of unauthorized dissemination of CI Materials, which could pose a serious risk to the safety of the confidential informant.

During this drug trafficking investigation, the government utilized a confidential informant who participated in multiple controlled drug transactions. The CI Materials include identifying

1 information about the confidential informant, as well as audio and
2 video recordings that capture the voice and appearance of the
3 confidential informant. There is a significant risk in this case
4 that the defendants may seek to retaliate against the confidential
5 informant or attempt to intimidate the confidential informant to
6 prevent him/her from cooperating with the government's investigation
7 and prosecution.

8 The Proposed Protective Order provides heightened protections
9 for CI Materials. These protections include: (a) defense counsel or
10 a pre-cleared member of the Defense Team must be present when
11 defendants or any witnesses are reviewing CI Materials; (b) at the
12 conclusion of any meeting at which defendants or witnesses are
13 permitted to view CI Materials, the CI Materials must be returned to
14 the Defense Team, who shall take all such materials with him or her;
15 (c) defendants must not take any CI Materials out of any room in
16 which defendants are meeting with the Defense Team; and (d) CI
17 Materials must not be left unattended in any vehicle.

18 Courts in this district, including this Court, routinely approve
19 of the provision requiring defense counsel to be present when
20 witnesses review information related to confidential informants or
21 cooperating witnesses. See, e.g., Henriquez, 2:25-cr-00104-AH-1,
22 Dkt. 54 (C. D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2025) (overruling defense objections);
23 United States v. Vo, 8:24-cr-00075-DOC, Dkt. 52 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6,
24 2024); United States v. Bonilla, 2:24-cr-00500-JFW, Dkts. 88, 95
25 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 2024); United States v. Alvarado, 2:20-cr-00155-JFW,
26 Dkt. 71 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2022); United States v. Ramos, 2:22-cr-
27 00354-RGK, Dkt. 158 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 1, 2022); United States v.
28 Rodriguez-Martinez, 2:22-cr-00337-SVW, Dkt. 21 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29,

1 2022); United States v. Hurtado Olivares, 2:22-cr-00248-ODW, Dkt. 43
2 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2022).

3 Given the serious nature of the charges and the highly sensitive
4 nature of CI Materials, the government believes that every effort
5 must be made to protect material related to the confidential
6 informant. Consistent with this aim, the government's proposed order
7 will ensure adequate protection of CI Materials by primarily tasking
8 the defense counsel -- who, unlike other members of the defense team,
9 is an officer of the court -- with ensuring compliance with the
10 Protective Order. As such, defense counsel has ethical duties that
11 uniquely position them to ensure that CI Materials will be adequately
12 protected. Allowing CI Materials to be viewed by witnesses outside
13 of defense counsel's presence increases the risk of unauthorized use
14 and dissemination of the protected materials. In recognition of this
15 need, courts in this district have approved the provision requiring
16 defense counsel to be present when defendant or defense witnesses
17 review protected information. See, e.g., United States v. Ortiz,
18 2:22-cr-00401-MCS, Dkt. 41 (C. D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2022); United States
19 v. Sexton, 2:19-cr-00781-MWF-1, Dkt. 43 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 2020);
20 United States v. Monteagudo, 2:19-cr-00690-ODW-2, Dkt. 30 (C.D. Cal.
21 Feb. 12, 2020).

22 Moreover, as counsel of record, defense counsel is responsible
23 for ensuring compliance with a protective order, is presumably the
24 person on the defense team who would be most familiar with the orders
25 terms and requirements, and is the person who will ultimately have to
26 answer to the Court in the event of a violation. Thus, it is vital
27 for defense counsel to be present when the most sensitive of
28 materials -- CI Materials that have the potential to reveal a CI's

1 identity -- are viewed by defendant or other defense witnesses. Any
2 minimal burden this condition may impose on defense counsel is
3 warranted by the significant countervailing concerns for safety.

4 Accordingly, the United States requests that the Court overrule
5 counsel's objections to paragraph 6(;) .

6 **D. Witnesses or Potential Witnesses Should Have to Agree "In
Writing" to Be Bound by the Protective Order (¶ 6(1))**

7 Defense counsel objects to the provision in Paragraph 6(1) of
8 the Proposed Protective Order requiring that witnesses agree "in
9 writing" to be bound by the terms of the protective order before
10 viewing any protected discovery. (Proposed Protective Order ¶ 6(1).)
11 The purposes of this "in writing" requirement are to impress upon
12 witnesses the importance of safeguarding protected information and to
13 ensure there is a binding written record of all individuals subject
14 to the protective order. Should the government ever need to enforce
15 the Proposed Protective Order or determine how an unauthorized
16 individual came to possess protected information, it can do so based
17 on that record.
18

19 In lieu of the "in writing" protection, defense counsel may
20 propose that a member of the defense team would verbally communicate
21 the terms of the Proposed Protective Order to a potential witness,
22 who would then verbally agree to be bound by its requirements, and
23 that defense counsel would maintain a list containing the names of
24 persons who agreed orally to be bound by the Proposed Protective
Order.
25

26 Absent the protections of the "in-writing" requirement, however,
27 the Proposed Protective Order will do little to prevent the
unauthorized dissemination of the CI's identifying information or
28

1 other Confidential Information. Any member of the Defense Team could
2 show protected information to potential witnesses -- who could be
3 associates or co-conspirators -- subject only to an unspecified
4 verbal explanation of the confidentiality requirements. That
5 explanation may vary across members of the Defense Team and depend on
6 the circumstance or timing of the witness contact, or it may be
7 forgotten entirely. Under such circumstances, witnesses may fail to
8 grasp the importance of safeguarding protected information.
9 Moreover, it would be virtually impossible to enforce the Proposed
10 Protective Order or prevent further dissemination due to the lack of
11 an adequate written record. Any potential witness could claim that
12 certain provisions were not conveyed in the oral advisement, or that
13 they did not receive the advisement at all, and there would be no
14 written record to contradict their claims. It is therefore critical
15 that witnesses personally read and acknowledge the full terms of the
16 Proposed Protective Order.

17 Moreover, the in-writing requirement would not present any
18 hardship to defense counsel's investigation of the case. The in-
19 writing requirement is narrowly tailored and imposes no obligations
20 on witnesses other than to simply agree in writing not to divulge
21 sensitive information to others. The significant countervailing
22 interest in ensuring the confidential informant's safety and privacy
23 far outweighs the minimal burden, if any, this provision might place
24 on witnesses, defense counsel, and/or defendant. See, e.g., United
25 States v. Hovhannisyan, CR 19-411-GW (C.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2020), Dkt.
26 22 at 2, ("[M]ost persons would understand that, in order to be shown
27 another individual's private financial information, the person would
28 have to agree in writing not to use or disclose that information to

1 anyone outside of the lawsuit."). Because it is imperative that
 2 witnesses be shown the entire protective order and read each of its
 3 terms, taking a few moments to obtain a witness's signature -- which
 4 does not take much more effort than recording a witness's oral assent
 5 -- is a reasonable and justifiable measure to mitigate the safety
 6 risks associated with disclosing CI and PII materials.

7 Recognizing the importance of the in-writing requirement, this
 8 Court, like others in this district, has routinely approved
 9 protective orders with the in-writing requirement over defense
 10 objection. See, e.g., Vo, 8:24-cr-00075-DOC, Dkt. 52 (C.D. Cal. Nov.
 11 6, 2024) (approving "in writing" requirement over defendant's
 12 objections); Hicks, 8:20-cr-00140-VAP, Dkt. 60 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 14,
 13 2021) (same); United States v. Moises Carrillo-Marquez, 2:24-cr-
 14 00449-MCS (C.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2024) (same). Accordingly, the Court
 15 should overrule defendant's objection, follow the weight of authority
 16 in this district, and enter a protective order requiring witnesses or
 17 potential witnesses to agree in writing to be bound by its terms.

18 **E. At the Conclusion of Appellate and Post-Conviction
 19 Proceedings, Defense Counsel Should Return or Destroy CI
 Materials (¶ 6(r))**

20 Defense counsel has also objected to the Proposed Protective
 21 Order's Requirement that "[w]ithin 30 days of the conclusion of
 22 appellate and post-conviction proceedings, defense counsel shall
 23 return CI Materials to the government or certify that such materials
 24 have been destroyed." Proposed Protective Order, Paragraph 6(r),
 25 (s).

26 The requirement that CI Materials be returned or destroyed is
 27 consistently requested by the government and granted by courts in this
 28 district. See, e.g., United States v. Gottfried, 2:24-cr-00308-JLS,

1 Dkt. 29 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2024); United States v. Sumber, 2:24-cr-
2 00419-WLH, Dkt. 24 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2024); United States v. Valencia,
3 2:24-cr-00118-JFW, Dkt. 41 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 4, 2024); United States v.
4 Alvarado, 2:20-cr-00155-JFW, Dkt. 71 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2022); United
5 States v. Hurtado Olivares, 2:22-cr-00248-ODW, Dkt. 43 (C.D. Cal. July
6 21, 2022); United States v. Torres, 2:21-cr-00294-GW, Dkt. 47 (C.D. Cal.
7 Aug. 30, 2021).

8 The rationale behind this prohibition is simple: avoiding an
9 unnecessary risk that CI Materials will be stolen or inadvertently
10 disseminated, the CI's identity exposed, and his or her safety
11 threatened. As detailed above, this is not an imagined risk.
12 Allowing CI Materials to exist in the Defense Team's possession
13 indefinitely, even after all relevant proceedings have ended, would
14 prolong and compound that risk, possibly forever.

15 It is not clear what burden or hindrance this provision would put
16 on defense counsel. By its terms, this provision only applies at the
17 conclusion of appellate and post-conviction proceedings, at which point
18 defense counsel and Defendant would have no need for the CI Materials.
19 Nor has defense counsel identified any ethical obligations to defendant
20 this provision would violate, given that it only applies after the
21 conclusion of appellate and post-conviction proceedings. Additionally,
22 the provision would only apply to CI Materials, which are the most
23 sensitive materials in the case and provide a serious concrete threat to
24 the safety of CIs, while PII Materials may be kept pursuant to the
25 California Business and Professions Code and the California Rules of
26 Professional Conduct. See Proposed Protective Order, Paragraph 6(r).
27 Accordingly, the Court should also overrule this objection.

28

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully requests
3 that this Court grant the government's ex parte application and enter
4 the Proposed Protective Order attached hereto.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DECLARATION OF DAVID C. LACHMAN

I, DAVID C. LACHMAN, declare as follows:

1. I am an Assistant United States Attorney in the United States Attorney's Office for the Central District of California. I am assigned to represent the government in this case.

2. I have already produced certain key documents in discovery to defense counsel totaling 3,745 pages, including photographs of the crime scene and gathered evidence, audio recording of defendant, documents relating to defendant's criminal history and arrest, law enforcement reports, search warrants, and cell site and GPS tracker records.

3. I am also in possession of certain categories of sensitive discovery materials, including video and audio recordings involving confidential informants, messages involving confidential informants, and reports detailing the actions of confidential informants.

4. On July 7, 2025, I emailed Deputy Federal Public Defender Rebecca Harris a draft protective order.

5. On July 7, 2025, Ms. Harris responded, stating that while she did not object to the government's request for a protective order generally in this case, she objected to paragraphs 6(c), 6(e), 6(l), and 6(r) of the Proposed Protective Order.

6. I informed Ms. Harris that I intended to file an ex parte application to enter a proposed protective order consistent with the terms proposed by the government. She requested 48 hours to oppose the government's anticipated ex parte application.

8. The government and defense counsel have reached an impasse on these provisions of the Proposed Protective Order. As a result, I respectfully apply ex parte for this protective order to ensure that

1 defense counsel has adequate time to review the protected material in
2 this case before trial.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United
4 States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that
5 this declaration is executed at Los Angeles, California, July 19,
6 2025.

7
8 /s/
9 DAVID C. LACHMAN

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28